

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA

| | | |
|------------------------------------|---|---------------------------|
| Rhonda McCrimmon, |) | C/A No. 5:11-1718-JFA-KDW |
| |) | |
| Plaintiff, |) | |
| v. |) | ORDER |
| |) | |
| Michael J. Astrue, Commissioner of |) | |
| Social Security, |) | |
| |) | |
| Defendant. |) | |
| _____ |) | |

The plaintiff, Rhonda McCrimmon, brings this action pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 405(g) to obtain judicial review of the final decision of the Commissioner of Social Security (Commissioner) denying her claim for disability insurance benefits and supplemental security income under Title II of the Social Security Act, 42 U.S.C. §§ 401–433.

The Magistrate Judge assigned to this action¹ has prepared a thorough Report and Recommendation wherein she suggests that the Commissioner’s decision to deny benefits should be affirmed. The Report sets forth in detail the relevant facts and standards of law on this matter, and the court incorporates such without a recitation.

The parties were advised of their right to submit objections to the Report and Recommendation, which was entered on the docket on May 21, 2012. However, neither party filed objections to the Report and the time within which to do so has now expired. In

¹ The Magistrate Judge’s review is made in accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) and Local Civil Rule 73.02. The Magistrate Judge makes only a recommendation to this court. The recommendation has no presumptive weight, and the responsibility to make a final determination remains with the court. *Mathews v. Weber*, 423 U.S. 261 (1976). The court is charged with making a *de novo* determination of those portions of the Report to which specific objection is made and the court may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the recommendation of the Magistrate Judge, or recommit the matter to the Magistrate Judge with instructions. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1).


the absence of specific objections to the Report of the Magistrate Judge, this court is not required to give any explanation for adopting the recommendation. *See Camby v. Davis*, 718 F.2d 198, 199 (4th Cir. 1983).

It is the duty of the ALJ reviewing the case, and not the responsibility of the courts, to make findings of fact and resolve conflicts in the evidence. This court's scope of review is limited to the determination of whether the findings of the Commissioner are supported by substantial evidence taking the record as a whole, *Craig v. Chater*, 76 F.3d 585, 589 (4th Cir. 1996), and whether the correct law was applied," *Walls v. Barnhart*, 296 F.3d 287, 290 (4th Cir. 2002).

After a careful review of the record, including the findings of the ALJ, the briefs from the plaintiff and the Commissioner, and the Magistrate Judge's Report, this court finds the Report is proper and is incorporated herein by reference. Accordingly, the Commissioner's decision is affirmed.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

June 27, 2012
Columbia, South Carolina


Joseph F. Anderson, Jr.
United States District Judge